

Message

**From:** Blankinship, Amy [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=D180951A173741FA9A76A3A3A3EB6794-BLANKINSHIP, AMY]  
**Sent:** 9/22/2020 7:56:58 PM  
**To:** Lin, James [lin.james@epa.gov]; Wente, Stephen [Wente.Stephen@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** RE: Aldicarb - Request - Modeling worst case with current water distribution numbers

So based on the EDWCs post PCA – it seems that TX provides the highest EDWCs (I was thinking it was the FL post PCA with the highest, but I was wrong).

Steve – thoughts?

Soil Depth	1-day average EDWC (ppb)	HUC-2 3 (FL) 14.2%	HUC-2 12 (TX) 20.8%	HUC-2 13 (TX) 3%
2 inches	39.2	5.57	8.15	1.18
3 inches	17.0	2.41	3.54	0.51
6 inches	4.24	0.60	0.88	0.13

---

**From:** Lin, James <lin.james@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 22, 2020 3:48 PM  
**To:** Blankinship, Amy <Blankinship.Amy@epa.gov>; Wente, Stephen <Wente.Stephen@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Aldicarb - Request - Modeling worst case with current water distribution numbers

I am not sure about which one to use.

HUC-2	PCA cotton+orchard+vegetables
3 (Florida)	14.2%
12 (Texas)	20.8%
13 (Texas)	3%

---

**From:** Blankinship, Amy <Blankinship.Amy@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 22, 2020 3:37 PM  
**To:** Lin, James <lin.james@epa.gov>; Wente, Stephen <Wente.Stephen@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Aldicarb - Request - Modeling worst case with current water distribution numbers

Oh....so for the post-PCA, I'm assuming they will need to be adjusted by the PCA factor (say for FL since it provides the highest EDWCs).

I think we would want to provide them post-PCA for this exercise. Right?

I see Will also has another question.

---

**From:** Lin, James <lin.james@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 22, 2020 3:35 PM  
**To:** Blankinship, Amy <Blankinship.Amy@epa.gov>; Wente, Stephen <Wente.Stephen@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Aldicarb - Request - Modeling worst case with current water distribution numbers

Those are pre-PCA.

---

**From:** Blankinship, Amy <Blankinship.Amy@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 22, 2020 3:31 PM  
**To:** Lin, James <lin.james@epa.gov>; Wente, Stephen <Wente.Stephen@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Aldicarb - Request - Modeling worst case with current water distribution numbers

Thanks.

---

**From:** Lin, James <lin.james@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 22, 2020 3:26 PM  
**To:** Blankinship, Amy <Blankinship.Amy@epa.gov>; Wente, Stephen <Wente.Stephen@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Aldicarb - Request - Modeling worst case with current water distribution numbers

The file names are self-explain. FL1 – 1.5 inches; FL2 – 2 inches; and FL3 – 3 inches.

---

**From:** Blankinship, Amy <Blankinship.Amy@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 22, 2020 3:17 PM  
**To:** Lin, James <lin.james@epa.gov>; Wente, Stephen <Wente.Stephen@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Aldicarb - Request - Modeling worst case with current water distribution numbers

Thanks, so quick! Can we prepare the timeseries files for the 3 depths: 1.5, 2.0 and 3.0 inches? Then we can share them with HED/RD. I think that they will be most interested in the 1.5 and 2 inches.

Amy

---

**From:** Lin, James <lin.james@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 22, 2020 3:15 PM  
**To:** Blankinship, Amy <Blankinship.Amy@epa.gov>; Wente, Stephen <Wente.Stephen@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Aldicarb - Request - Modeling worst case with current water distribution numbers

1.5 inches	daily 67.5 ppb, annual 2.80 ppb, entire mean 0.764 ppb
3 inches	daily 17.0 ppb, annual 0.704 ppb, entire mean 0.192 ppb

---

**From:** Blankinship, Amy <Blankinship.Amy@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 22, 2020 3:02 PM  
**To:** Lin, James <lin.james@epa.gov>; Wente, Stephen <Wente.Stephen@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Aldicarb - Request - Modeling worst case with current water distribution numbers

Hi,

While I just sent an email on the PCA/PCT work – while I have mentioned this before, I forgot to forward this email with the ask for us regarding the surface water numbers. RD would like to know how bad we are failing now pre PCA/PCT work and have requested that EFED generate the SW timeseries for HED. While we have the ones for the 2 inches, it seem that RD is also asking for us to generate EDWCs using the 1.5 inch incorporation depth.

Jim- can generate SW EDCWs using the 1.5 in incorporation depth in the next couple of days? I know you are still working on getting thiram/fenbucon DRAs finalized.

Thanks,  
Amy

---

**From:** Rate, Debra <Rate.Debra@epa.gov>

**Sent:** Monday, September 14, 2020 5:00 PM

**To:** Blankinship, Amy <Blankinship.Amy@epa.gov>; Donovan, William <donovan.william@epa.gov>

**Cc:** Metzger, Michael <Metzger.Michael@epa.gov>; Johnson, Marion <Johnson.Marion@epa.gov>; Adeeb, Shanta <Adeeb.Shanta@epa.gov>

**Subject:** Aldicarb - Request - Modeling worst case with current water distribution numbers

Hi Amy, Will,

Sorry it has taken a bit of time for me to get back to you following the last team meeting.

Marion has met with Marietta and she does want to know what the current dietary risk picture is with water numbers – so there will be a before and after picture of the risk once EFED has applied the new modeling/refinements.

Amy, does EFED have current water distribution numbers (surface water) that can be provided to Will (HED) to use in the DEEM run? Do you need to do any additional work to get these numbers? Will, would you be able to run the DEEM when you get the new numbers?

Amy: Additionally, the registrant has confirmed that the incorporation depth and well setback numbers provided on the proposed labeling are correct (i.e., 2-3 inches incorporation). Even though the registrant says 2-3 inches incorporation, based on the conversation with the registrant and BEADs research, I think we are hoping that you might be able to run a range of depths that would also include 1.5 inches (max. depth stated on call with registrant in January '20).

Will: When we were discussing the status of our reviews with the registrant, we planted the seed that they may want to begin thinking about other crops/uses that may need to be cancelled to allow for the citrus uses. They said that it would be unlikely that the registrant would cancel any existing uses, but that maybe they would consider letting go of grapefruit. Would it also be possible to do a DEEM run for food alone without the grapefruit use to let us see how much room in the risk cup might be gained?

We really appreciate your help in running these extra modeling runs/scenarios. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Many thanks!

Debra

Debra Rate, Ph.D.  
Senior Regulatory Specialist  
Invertebrate & Vertebrate Branch 2  
Registration Division  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Phone: 703-306-0309